

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/973,680 | 10/09/2001 | Jerome James Workman JR. | KCC-16,805 | 5767 |
| 35844 | 7590 09/21/2005 | | EXAMINER | |
| | ETERSEN & ERICK: HIGGINS ROAD | NASSER, ROBERT L | | |
| | ESTATES, IL 60195 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | • | | 3736 | |
| | | DATE MAIL ED: 00/21/2005 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------------|---------------|--------------|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | | 09/973,680 | WORKMAN ET AL | . . | | | | |
| | | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | |
| | | Robert L. Nasser | 3736 | | | | | |
| | The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | | | |
| 1)[🖂 | Responsive to communication(s) filed or | n 06 September 2005. | | | | | | |
| | This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final. | | | | | | | |
| 3)□ | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | | | |
| ,— | closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | | | |
| 4)🛛 | Claim(s) <u>1-24 and 36-46</u> is/are pending | in the application. | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>13-24 and 39</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12,36-38 and 40-46</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | | | |
| - | 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | | |
| 8) | 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | | |
| Applicati | ion Papers | | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | | |
| 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | | |
| ,— | Applicant may not request that any objection | | • | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: | | | | | | | | |
| ۵, | | uments have been received. | | | | | | |
| Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | | | | | | |
| application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | | | | | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Attachmen | nt(s) | | | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) | | | | | | | | |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date Paper No(s)/Mail Date Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) Other: | | | | | | | | |

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/6/2005 has been entered.

Claims 13-24 and 39 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 11/1/2004.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 36 and 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kawaguchi et al 5921948. Kawaguchi et al shows a surgical dressing having only a polyethylene backing material with a skin adhering pressure sensitive adhesive attached thereto. The examiner notes that Kawaguchi. is not for the same purpose as applicant's invention. However, the only difference is intended use and the device is capable of measuring drug transfer. With respect to claims 42-44, it is the examiner's position that the adhesives listed in the paragraph bridging columns 3 and 4 include the

Art Unit: 3736

enumerated adhesives in the claims. As such, the adhesive would have the recited properties.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 9-12, 37-38, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawaguchi et al. Kawaguchi et al shows a bandage having only a polyethylene backing material with a skin adhering adhesive attached thereto. The reference does not specify the weight average molecular weight. However, the examiner notes that applicant has not stated that the specific molecular weight solves a stated problem or is for a particular purpose. As such, it the exact molecular weight would have been a mere matter of design choice for one skilled in the art. The examiner notes that Kawaguchi et al. is not for the same purpose as applicant's invention. However, the only difference is intended use and the device is capable of measuring drug transfer. With respect to claims 5-7, it is the examiner's position that the adhesives listed in the paragraph bridging columns 3 and 4 include he enumerated adhesives in the claims. As such, the adhesive would have the recited properties. With respect to claim 9, the backing layer of Kawaguchi is 60 microns thick (see column 4, line 66). With respect to claims 10-12 and 46, applicant has admitted that it is known to provide packaging materials with an adhesive bandage and that adhesive bandages

Application/Control Number: 09/973,680

Art Unit: 3736

come in the sizes and shapes claimed. Claims 37 and 38 are rejected for the reasons given above.

Claims 3, 4, and 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawaguchi et al in view of Dow Jr 5120325. Kawaguchi does not disclose that the surface of the dressing is textured to resemble human skin. Dow Jr. teaches such a bandage that is textured to resemble human skin to provide a cosmetic benefit while it covers the wound, i.e. to hide the appearance of the wound. As such, it would have been obvious to modify Kawaguchi to include such surface texturing, to provide the patient with a source of concealment of his or her wound. It is the examiner's opinion by being textured to resemble skin, it meets the criteria of claims 3 and 40.

Claims 8 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawaguchi et al in view of Macphee et al 6762336. Macphee et al teaches the equivalence of adhesive and electrostatic adhesion (see column 4, lines 44-52). Hence, it would have been obvious to modify Dow jr. to use electrostatic adhesive, as it is merely the substitution of one known equivalent adhesion for another.

Applicant's arguments filed 9/6/2005 have been fully considered but they are deemed moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Both of Fujisawa and ling Chen show surgical dressing made from only a polyethylene or polypropylene backing and an adhesive.

Application/Control Number: 09/973,680 Page 5

Art Unit: 3736

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert L. Nasser whose telephone number is (571) 272-4731. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, variable hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Max Hindenburg can be reached on (571) 272-4726. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert L. Nasser Primary Examiner Art Unit 3736

Roll & Mason

RLN May 12, 2005

ROBERT L NASSER PRIMALIT EVAMINER